UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/517,331	12/09/2004	Claudio Miguel Suarez	331.1082	2921	
	7590 02/22/2019 dson & Kappel, LLC	EXAMINER			
485 7th Avenue			HAND, MELANIE JO		
14th Floor New York, NY 10018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3761		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/22/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/517,331	SUAREZ, CLAUDIO MIGUEL		
Examiner	Art Unit		

MELANIE	J. HAND	3761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	ON IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with ap for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. periods:	an amendment, affidavit peal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final i	ejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY C MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	(MONTHS from the mailing HECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three r may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	the corresponding amount c atutory period for reply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension there Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the tin AMENDMENTS	of (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
— <u>—</u>	the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	20102
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 	_		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or	appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying th	e issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspond NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	ing number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See att	ached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if s non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was re-	<u>ll</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the sta REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NO See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowand	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/0 13. ☐ Other: 	8) Paper No(s)		
	lelanie J Hand/ imary Examiner, Art U	nit 3761	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicants assert that Roxendal does not teach a transfer layer having a top layer of predominately hydrophobic fibrous material. Applicants assert that Roxendal merely discloses a hydrophilicity gradient in the z-direction of layer (5). This argument is not persuasive because applicants' specification does not specifically define "hydrophobic" or "hydrophilic." The terms "hydrophobic" and "hydrophilic" are qualitative or relative terms (see definitions for "hydrophobic" and "hydrophilic" in Selected Terms in Colloid and Interface Science, www.ucalgary.ca/-schramm/lyophil.htm; see also, Textile Chemistry Terminology, www.fabricology.com/science/textile-chemistry.php, both previously cited). Roxendal's top layer (5d) is of fibrous material that is predominately hydrophobic (low degree of moisture absorption) relative to that of lower layer (5e). The lower layer (5e) is made of a fibrous material that is predominately hydrophilic (high degree of moisture absorption) relative to the top layer (5d). In light of the lack of new or persuasive arguments overcoming the outstanding claim rejections, the reply is not entered.